DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 854 FL 008 256

AUTHOR Kachru, Braj B.
TITLE Indian English: A Sociolinguistic Profile of a Transplanted Language.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTOPS Bilingualism; Cultural Factors; Developing Nations; *English; Grammar; *Indians; Language Planning; *Language Role; *Language Usage; Language Variation; Multilingualism; Non Western Civilization; Phonology; Semantics; *Sociolinguistics; Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS *India

ABSTRACT

This paper is a study in language acculturation with special reference to the Indianization of the English language. It briefly traces the history of the diffusion of bilingualism in English on the culturally and linguistically pluralistic Indian subcontinent. The functional roles of English are discussed and the formal influences of Indian cultural and linguistic contexts are illustrated from the sound system, grammar, lexis and semantics of Indian English. These formal characteristics manifest themselves in what may be termed the "Indianness" in this variety of English. The crucial questions of "intelligibility" and "variation" are examined with reference to the functions of English in India. The development of, and attitudes toward, Indian writing in English is briefly discussed. The role of English in India's language planning is related to various linguistic and political pressure groups in pre- and post-Independence India. The aim is to provide a sociolinguistic profile of a non-native language in a multilinguistic non-Western context. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132854

INDIAN ENGLISH: A SOCIOLINGUISTIC PROFILE OF A TRANSPLANTED LANGUAGE

BRAJ B. KACHRU

ABSTRACT

This paper is a study in language acculturation with special reference to the Indianization of the English language. It briefly traces the history of the diffusion of bilingualism in English on the culturally and linguistically pluralistic Indian subcontinent. The functional roles of English are discussed and the formal influences of Indian cultural and linguistic contexts are illustrated from the sound system, grammar, lexis and semantics of Indian English. These formal characteristics manifest themselves in what may be termed the Indianness in this variety of English. The crucial questions of "intelligibility" and "variation" are examined with reference to the functions of English in India. The development of, and attitudes toward, Indian writing in English is briefly discussed. The role of English in India's language planning is related to various linguistic and political pressure groups in pre- and post-Independence India. The aim is to provide a sociolinguistic profile of a non-native language in a multilinguistic non-Western context.

FL008256

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BRAJ B. KACHRU is Professor of Linguistics and Head of the Department of Linguistics at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. He did his undergraduate and graduate studies at the Universities of Kashmir, Allahabad, and Edinburgh. His major areas of research and teaching are sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, Kashmiri, and South Asian English.

1.0. INTRODUCTION:

The linguistically and culturally pluralistic Indian subcontinent provides primarily two cases of language acculturation which involve the Indianization of foreign languages. In chronological terms, the first case is that of the Persian language and the second, that of the English language. The result of such acculturation is the development of two distinct non-native Indian varieties of these two languages, termed INDIAN PERSIAN and INDIAN ENGLISH. These terms are used both in a geographical sense and in a linguistic sense. In geographical terms Indian Persian and Indian English refer to those varieties of these two languages which developed on what was traditionally called the Indian subcontinent and now includes Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan. In linguistic terms the modifier Indian refers to the linguistic processes used by the Indians toward the Indianization of Persian and English which then resulted in the Indianness of these two languages. The Persian parallel is important here because to a large extent the processes of Indianization have been more or less identical in both the languages. I am not concerned with the discussion of Indian Persian here, but the analogy is important in order to understand the development of Indian English.

The linguistic characteristics of Indian English are transparent in the Indian English sound system (phonology), sentence construction (syntax), vocabulary (lexis), and meaning (semantics). There are already several studies which discuss these aspects (For a bibliography, see Kachru 1969: 669:678). The reasons for

these transparent Indian features are not difficult to find. In India, Indian English is generally used as a second language, which is acquired after one has learnt a first language, or what is usually called the mother tongue. This then results in interference (or transfer) from one's mother tongue in the second language.[1] We see the same principle at work, for example, in the non-native varities of Hindi. When we identify a person as a speaker of South Indian Hindi or Kashmiri Hindi we are actually referring to such transferred characteristics. The problem of interference in Indian English becomes more complex, since the interference is caused by a large number of mother tongues. The Indian constitution recognizes fifteen major languages and the Census Report identifies over 1,652 languages and dialects.[2] The other reason, which is often neglected in the literature, is that in India the English language is used in a different sociocultural context than that of, say, America, Australia or Britain. The distinct sociocultural parameters in which the English language has been used in India for almost two hundred years have resulted in a large number of innovations which have been termed "Indianisms" (Kachru 1965: 405-408). This is not a unique linguistic situation. A large number of Americanisms or Australianisms are labeled as such because the English-speaking settlers in America and Australia were using the English language in a new context and had to mold the English language to the context of the new world. (For Americanisms see Mencken 1941: 113-21; for Australianisms see Morris 1898: 160 and Ransom 1966.) In our discussion on Indian English we shall, therefore, consider linguistic interference and the Indian cultural context as essential for the understanding and description of the Indianness in this variety of English.

2.0. HISTORY

We are not concerned with the history of the English language but rather with the development of its one non-native variety which we have already labeled "Indian English". Therefore, we shall

restrict this section to the introduction of bilingualism in English in India, its various stages of implementation, its various uses and the eventual development of this "alien" language into an Indianized variety.

An earlier study (Kachru 1969: 629-634) marks three phases in the introduction of bilingualism in English in India. The first phase is the "missionary phase" which includes the efforts of the Christian missionaries who went to the Indian subcontinent to proselytize (see Duff 1837; Sherring 1889; Richter 1908 and Law 1915). The second phase was essentially the phase of "local demand" for English during which prominent Indians such as Raja Rammohan Roy (1772-1833) and Rajunath Hari Navalkar (about 1770) made efforts to persuade the officials of the East India Company to impart instruction in English in preference to Sanskrit (or to Arabic) so that young Indians would be exposed to the scientific knowledge of the west. In their view, the exclusive dependence of Indians on Sanskrit, Persian, Arabic, or what they termed the "Indian vernaculars" would not contribute to this goal. As evidence of such local demand it is customary to present the letter of Raja Rammohan Roy addressed to Lord Amherst (1773-1857) dated December 11, 1823. In his letter Roy expresses disappointment at the establishment of Sanskrit School in Calcutta rather than using the available funds for

> ...employing European gentlemen of talent and education to instruct the natives of India in mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry, anatomy, and other useful sciences, which the natives of Europe have carried to a degree of perfection that has raised them above the inhabitants of other parts of the world... (Sharp 1920: 99-101; also Wadia 1954: 1-13).

It is claimed that Roy's letter was responsible for starting the well-known Oriental-Anglicist controversy which forms a fascinating chapter in the history of education in India.

It is this controversy which resulted in the third phase and culminated in the prolonged and insightful discussion on the merits

and demerits of the oriental and Anglicist (Occidental) educational systems for India. This phase began after 1765, when the earlier political maneuvering of the East India Company finally resulted in the stabilization of the authority of the Company. At that time there were primarily two attitudes towards introducing English on the Indian subcontinent. The administrators of the Raj themselves did not have a unanimous policy: they were divided into two groups. The Anglicist group included Charles Grant (1746-1823), Lord Moira (1754-1826) and T. B. Macaulay (1800-1859). The spokesman for the orientalist group was H. T. Prinsep (1792-1878), who disagreed with the Anglicist point of view and expressed his view in a note, dated February 15, 1835. The dissenting group, however, could not stop the highly controversial, and far-reaching Minute of Macaulay from passing: it was passed on February 2, 1835. Macaulay's aim, as he indicates in the Minute, was to form a sub-culture in India:

> ...a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern, a class of persons, Indians in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect (See Kachru 1969: 633).

On March 7, 1835, the Minute finally got a Seal of Approval from Lord William Bentick (1774-1839), and an official resolution endorsing Macaulay's resolution was passed. (For details see Clive 1973: 342-420). This resolution formed the cornerstone of the implementation of a language policy in India, and ultimately resulted in the diffusion of bilingualism in English. It is still controversial whether this decision to impose an "alien" language on the Indians was the correct decision. There is disagreement among Indian and Western scholars on this point and extreme positions have been presented by both the groups. One such view is presented by the British linguist J. R. Firth, in his characteristic way, when he says that "the superficiality characteristic of Indian education is an inheritance from the superficial Lord Macaulay" (Firth 1930: 210-11). It is said that twenty years after Macaulay had written the Minute on education, he came across it once more and expressed

the judgment that "it made a great revolution" (Clive 1973: 426). In retrospect after almost one and a half centuries, one must grant him that.

In the years that followed, as the British Raj became firm in India, the Anglicization of Indian education became greater, and slowly the English language gained deeper roots in an alien linguistic, cultural, administrative and educational setting. The period between 1765 and 1947 was thus the era of British patronage and encouragement of the English language in India. The first three universities were established in India in 1857 at Bombay, Calcutta and Madras; two more universities were added by the end of the century at Allahabad and Punjab (Lahore). By 1928 English had been accepted as the language of the elite, of the administration, and of the pan-Indian press. The English newspapers, though with a limited circulation, had acquired an influential reading public. In addition, another phenomenon with a far-reaching consequence was slowly developing, that of Indian literature in English (See below 5.0). The position of English in post-independence India is briefly discussed in a later section (See below 6.0).

3.0. VARIATION:

I have already used the term "Indian English" in this paper without providing the necessary explanations for it. I shall attempt to do so in this section. The cover term Indian English does not mean that there is complete homogeneity in the use of English in India, nor does it imply that all the Indian users of English have uniform proficiency in the understanding of and performance in English. One might ideally desire such a situation, but in the real world of first or second language use, one does not encounter such situations. Therefore, a uniformity in standard or in language use is not a characteristic of a human language. What one must look for is variation and whether such variation can be explained in terms of functional, sociocultural or educational parameters.

The variation in Indian English may be explained basically

on three parameters, namely those of region, ethnic group and proficiency. In the case of Indian English, regional or geographical variation by and large coincides with the regional language. The underlying reason for regional varieties such as Gujarati English (Harry 1962), Marathi English (Kelkar 1957) and Tamil English (Gopalkrishnan 1960) is the mother tongue of the speaker of each variety. The ethnic varieties of Indian English have yet to be studied in a serious sense, though claims have been made concerning special characteristics of Anglo-Indian English (Spencer 1966). Ethnic variation cuts across the regional language or dialect boundaries. The question of variation based on proficiency is crucial in the case of a second language. It can be better explained with reference to the "cline of bilingualism" (Kachru 1965: 393-396 and 1969: 636-637). The cline has been defined in terms of three arbitrarily determined "measuring points" namely the ambilingual point, the central point and the zero point. These three points provide indications of a speaker's proficiency in the use of Indian English, the ambilingual point being the highest point on the scale and the zero point the lowest -- the zero point, however, is not the end point at the bottom. In India, as elsewhere, it is not uncommon to find users of English with minimal competence in the language such as waiters, salesmen or tourist guides. Such people may use English in their restricted spheres of activity but their overall competence in the language is practically negligible. It is such "Englishes" in India which are labeled as Babu English, Butler English, Bearer English, and Kitchen English.

It is interesting that varieties such as Kitchen English or Babu English are sometimes used by Indians with native speakers of English, and in turn native speakers use the same type of language so that the Indian speaker of such a variety can understand it. It is an attempt to communicate in a variety of language which has undergone a process of pidginization. A good example of this is is given in Yule and Burnell (1903: 133-134).

> The broken English spoken by native servants in the Madras Presidency; which is not very much better than the Pigeon-English (sic) of China. It is a singular dialect; the present participle (e.g.) being used for the future indicative, and the preterite indicative being formed by "done"; thus I telling = "I will tell"; I done tell = "I have told"; done come = "actually arrived". Peculiar meanings are also attached to words.... The oddest characteristic about this jargon is (or was) that masters used it in speaking to their servants as well as servants to their masters.

We might then say that the Indian English speech community comprises all the above discussed varieties. At the one end of the spectrum we have educated (or standard) Indian English, and at the other end we have Kitchen English, with other varieties, such as Babu English, at various points on the spectrum. The following observation of Quirk is appropriate here (1972: 49):

> In the Indian and African countries, we find an even spectrum of kinds of English, which extends from those most like Pidgin to those most like standard English, with imperceptible gradations the whole way along.

The standard variety of Indian English is used by those bilinguals who rank around the central point on the cline of bilingualism. In numerical terms Indian English users constitute only 3% of the Indian population; that is, out of the total population there are seventeen million speakers of Indian English. This figure is impressive, considering that the total percentage of speakers of several "scheduled languages" in India is less than the percentage of the speakers of English, or close to that figure, for example, Assamese (1.63%); Kannada (3.96%), Malayalam (4 %); Oriya (3.62%), and Punjabi (3%).

English is the state language of two states in eastern India, namely Meghalaya and Nagaland. It is the main medium of instruction in the majority of institutions of higher learning at the post-graduate level. It is taught as a second language at every stage of education in all the states of India.[3]

As a medium for interstate communication, the pan-Indian press, and broadcasting it has been used as a most powerful tool both before India's independence and during the post-independence period. The statistical profile of the role of English in the Indian press presented in the recent report (1974) of the Registrar General of India demonstrates that the impact of English is not only continuing but increasing.

The English press in India initiated serious journalism on the subcontinent. Out of the seven daily papers in India which have been in existence for over one hundred years, there are four in English, the other three being in Gujarati. The four English newspapers are the Times of India, Bombay (1850); the Pioneer, Lucknow (1865); the Mail, Madras (1867); and Amrita Bazar Patrika, Calcutta (1868). Out of a total of 12,653 newspapers registered in India in 1973, those in English accounted for 19.7% (2,493). The newspapers in Hindi accounted for 26.4% (3,340). The English newspapers had the highest circulation (22%). Of the number of periodicals published by the Central Government, those in English show the highest percentage (55.2%). The second highest number is those in Hindi. A comparative table of the total number of newspapers published in India during 1971, 1972 and 1973 is insightful. This number includes dailies, tri/bi-weeklies, weeklies and others.

Language	Year		
	1971	1972	1973
English	2,390	2,368	2,493
Hindi	3,116	3,083	3,340
Assamese	41	36	38
Bengali	760	731	784
Gujarati	594	565	599
Kannada	285	298	332
Kashmiri	--	--	1
Malayalam	481	451	488
Marathi	741	713	739
Oriya	117	128	140
Punjabi	259	241	263
Sanskrit	28	22	23
Sindhi	78	73	67
Tamil	615	607	580
Telugu	386	394	405
Urdu	1,005	929	990
Bilingual	955	956	1,013
Multilingual	217	204	226
Others	150	127	132
	12,218	11,926	12,653

The total number of periodicals devoted to specialized areas in 1973 was 11,755. A significant number of these were published in English (2,411) and Hindi (3,058).

English language newspapers are published in practically every part of the Indian Republic, thus providing evidence of the pan-Indianness of the English language. Out of 29 state or Union territories in India, English newspapers and periodicals are published in 27, including virtually every part of the country except

Arunachal Pradesh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli. The next two languages with an all-India spread are Hindi-Urdu and Sanskrit, in which newspapers or periodicals are published in 19, 16 and 12 states and territories, respectively.[4]

4.0. DESCRIPTION:

The available descriptions of the various aspects of educated or standard Indian English are very fragmentary. One reason for this lack of research may be the language attitude which both Indian and non-Indian speakers of English have shown toward this variety of English (See Prator 1968, Kachru 1969 and 1976). This attitude manifests itself in terms such as Babu English or Cheechee English which were earlier used for this variety. Even the term "Indian English" was used in a derogatory sense and Indians normally would not identify themselves as members of the Indian English speech community, preferring to consider themselves speakers of British English.[5] What I shall present below are certain selected characteristic features of Indian English. The observations made here include both the spoken and written styles of this variety of English.

A word of caution is in order here with reference to the formations included from the written styles of Indian English. A number of these formations are specifically used in a particular type of writing, e.g., in legal writing, in newspaper advertisements, or in Indian English fiction. In this sense, then, these are functionally restricted, and in statistical terms such formations have a low probability of occurence in Indian English in general. In linguistic literature such functionally determined items are termed "register-bound" items. In this sense, then, one might consider, for example, the formation salt giver in Mulk Raj Anand as much a part of Indian English as James Joyces' or E. E. Cummings' linguistic innovations are a part of British English and American English respectively. The difference is that one has to be careful to identify these as "register-bound" or "author-bound".

In the spoken form, the term "educated Indian English" is used in the same sense in which one uses terms such as "educated British English", "educated American English", or "educated Hindi". Educated speakers of these languages do not speak in an identical way - far from it. Their spoken language shows characteristics of class, area and education as does the spoken English of educated Indians. In addition, an Indian English user reveals other characteristics too; his English might reveal certain features which show that his mother tongue is Bengali or Hindi or Punjabi. If his mother tongue is Bengali, the chances are that he will not make a distinction between [s] as in same and [š] as in shame. Thus one might by appalled to get the response of shame to you on wishing a happy New Year to a Bengali English speaker. A Hindi speaker finds [istešan] easier to pronounce than the combination of st in the initial position in words such as station. One can add to this list from other Indian languages, too. But the illustrations are not crucial. What is important is the underlying reasons for this type of pattern which a bilingual shows in his second language. The phenomena of variation are not unique to Indian English. The homogeneity of a speech community is an ideal which linguists aspire to, but it is not a characteristic of human language. Therefore, if we say that there are American Englishes, British Englishes or Indian Englishes, we are not very far from the truth.

It is worth emphasizing that in spite of variation of various types the concept of homogeneity can easily be applied to the Indian English speech community. An Indian English speaker intuitively recognizes another Indian English speaker and also categorizes him as an "educated" speaker, or as one who does not come up to that standard. In India, then, the concept of a standard or educated Indian English is not as elusive as purists or cynics (e.g. Prator 1968) tend to believe. But, at the same time, when we study Indian English we are essentially making a study of a second language in a bilingual or a multilingual context. In such a context, as we

have discussed earlier, the effect of transfer, or what linguists term "interference", cannot be ignored.

The term bilingual implies that such a person has two linguistic systems which he uses for communication in appropriate situations. On the other hand, a multilingual person has more than two linguistic systems which he might use in his various spheres of activity. It is in such bilingual (or multilingual) situations that transfer (Kachru 1965: 398-400) or interference takes place. It is also claimed that the transfer (or interference) generally takes place from a dominant language (say, a mother tongue) to a less dominant language (say, a second language). There are also cases where the contrary might happen, namely, the second language might influence the first language. In India, there are several examples of this situation. Specifically, one can take the case of English. The Indianization of the English language is generally discussed in the literature on the subject, but there are examples of the English-ization of Indian languages too, and this influence is seen on their sound systems, grammars, and, of course, on their vocabularies (See Kachru, 1975c). The extent of interference is also closely linked with the cline of bilingualism. The more interference in a person's English, the lower he ranks on the cline.

4.1. SOUND SYSTEM:

A number of observations have been made in various studies to characterize the Indianness in Indian pronunciation of English; these are crucial for understanding "deviations" at this level. It is due to these characteristics that one can isolate the trans-parent features of Indian English. As I have stated elsewhere, these and other grammatical, lexical and semantic characteristics may be considered area-features, and termed "South Asian English" (see Kachru 1969: 634-644). I shall discuss some of the important characteristics below under various categories.

The first category is that of SYSTEMIC DIFFERENCES. The term 'system' is used here in a syntagmatic sense and refers primarily to the differences in the consonant or vowel inventory between

English and Indian English, or one of its regional dialects. In comparing the syllable structure of English and, say, Hindi, one will find that both these languages have CVC syllable structure. This is a correct observation, but this similarity can be misleading, since the items which comprise the total consonant inventory of one language may not be identical to the inventory of the other language. A good example is the consonants [f θ ð] in English; these consonants do not occur as members of the consonant inventory of any major Indian language. This then leads to the substitution of [ph, th, dh] for these sounds in Indian English. There is no need to elaborate on this point since it has been discussed even in elementary textbooks dealing with this aspect.

The second category is that of DISTRIBUTIONAL DIFFERENCES. The items in the consonant or vowel inventory may have some shared items which are phonetically "identical", but their distribution may not be identical. Again let us take an example from Hindi-Urdu. In Hindi-Urdu and in English we find the consonant combinations (clusters) sk, sl, sp. But the distribution of these clusters in these languages is different. In Indian English as spoken in the Hindi area we find that English station, school, stool, speech are pronounced as [isṭešan], [iskūl], [isṭūl], [ispīč], respectively. The reason is that in Hindi the clusters st, sk, sp do not occur in initial position in words. In fact this is one clue, among others, which marks the Indian English speakers of the Hindi area from the Indian English speakers of other areas.

The third category is termed SERIES SUBSTITUTION. This means that a complete series of consonants from an Indian language may be transferred into Indian English. An often discussed example of typical Indian pronunciation of English is the substitution for the English alveolar series of a retroflex series.

The fourth category may be termed PROSODIC TRANSFER. This involves the main non-segmental characteristics of Indian English, for example, deviation in the stress system. English is a stress-

timed language, as opposed to most of the Indian languages, which are syllable-timed. This difference between English and the Indian languages results in distinct rhythms: in syllable-timed languages the rhythm is based on arranging long and short syllables while in stress-timed languages it is based on the arrangement of stressed and unstressed syllables. This seems to be one of the main linguistic factors which impedes intelligibility between an Indian English speaker and a native English speaker. Systemic differences and distributional differences do not seem to be crucial for intelligibility (Bansal 1966).

4.2. GRAMMAR:

A detailed grammatical description of educated Indian English is not yet available. The following statements, therefore, do not present an outline of the total range of the "deviation" in Indian English. The term "deviation" is used in a special sense here and is not to be confused with "mistake" (see Kachru 1965: 396-397):

> A "mistake" may be defined as any "deviation" which is rejected by a native speaker of English as out of the linguistic "code" of the English language, and which may not be justified in Indian English on formal and/or contextual grounds. A "deviation", on the other hand, may involve differences from a norm, but such deviations may be explained in terms of the cultural and/or linguistic context in which a language functions.

A number of these observations are variety-oriented and mark members of the Indian English speech community as separate from users of other varieties of English. The other type of observations are register-oriented features. These features are characteristic of the typical registers of Indian English, which are definable with reference to the functions of Indian English in typically Indian socio-cultural settings. Consider, for example, the following collocations which are used primarily in the Indian political context: salt march (RH 36), salt-laws (H in A 55) or the much used fissiparous tendencies (L 23. 11. 65). A detailed

list of these and such other collocations may be found in Goffin (1934) and in Kachru (1965, 1969 and 1975a). The third type of collocations are author-oriented and may be present only in the works of creative Indian English writers who write about typically Indian contexts. These would include, among others, Mulk Raj Anand (b. 1905), Raja Rao (b. 1909), and R. K. Narayan (b. 1906). Such collocations provide linguistic clues to the style of a specific author in the same sense as do the stylistic features in the writings of, e.g., James Joyce or E. E. Cummings (See Desai 1974). There are also features which are text-oriented and may not be generalized as features of the total literary output of a writer. For example, the style of Kanthapura cannot be generalized as the style of Raja Rao just as we cannot generalize the style of "any one lived in a pretty how town" as the style of E. E. Cummmings. But in both these cases it is important to understand the style of these texts in order to understand the total STYLE REPERTOIRES of Raja Rao or E. E. Cummings.

It must be pointed out here that the linguistically definable Indianisms present a spectrum, and each item needs careful categorization. At one end this spectrum presents statistically high frequency Indianisms which may be generalized as variety-oriented features, and at the other end it presents text-specific and statistically marginal features such as the formation may the vessel of your life never float on the sea of existence (C, 20). This formation is both author-restricted and text-specific but it is a possible formation in Indian English, as are the "deviant" formations of Cummings or James Joyce in other "Englishes". Therefore, when it is claimed (Mukherjee 1971: 214) that one cannot "postulate 'Indian English' based on examples drawn from Indo-Anglian writers", one is confronting a confusion between language use and prescriptivism. It becomes more confusing when Mukherjee further claims (1971: 214):

> The Indo-Anglian writer should be allowed the freedom to experiment with the language for his own artistic

> needs rather than be heaved into a system of linguistics in search of that elusive medium - a standard Indian English.

Standard Indian English is no more "elusive" than is standard American English or standard West African English. An individual author is part of the style repertoire which a speech community uses, whether it is for "artistic needs" or "practical needs". In the description of language use, "artistic needs" for creative use of language are as much a part of the total range of language use as is purely functional use in ordering one's meal. In general observations about Indian English the concern is not necessarily with the scope, range and statistical frequency of formations. A judgment of that type, of course, is valid but not relevant to our present discussion.

I shall discuss below certain grammatical characteristics which mark "educated" Indian English as "deviant" from the "educated" native varieties of English.

First, let us consider some features involving sentence and clause structure. There is no large-scale empirical study which would provide detailed analysis. But intutively, and on the basis of very restricted analyses, it is claimed that in Indian English there is a tendency toward complex sentences. These result in large-scale embeddings (Kachru 1969: 644-647). The following excerpt from Kanthapura (p. 56) is illustrative.

> The day rose into the air and with it rose the dust of the morning, and the carts began to creak round the bulging rocks and the coppery peaks, and the sun fell into the river and pierced it to the pebbles, while the carts rolled on and on, fair carts of the Kanthapura fair....

One cannot generalize such statements, since R. K. Narayan's style is the opposite of Raja Rao's. But stylistic characteristics do not have to be uniform; generalizations are indicative of tendencies.[6]

Second, in constructions at the phrase level (verb phrase or noun phrase) we find several features. Let us consider, as an

example, the be + ing + verb construction in Indian English. In such constructions some Indian English users seem to 'violate' the selectional restriction applicable to such constructions in the native varieties of English, where the members of the sub-class of verbs such as hear and see do not occur in the progressive tenses. This restriction, on the other hand, does not apply to Hindi-Urdu verbs sunnā 'to hear', dekhnā 'to see' (e.g. mãi sun rahā hũ̃ 'I' 'listen' 'progressive' 'am'; 'I am listening'; mãi dekh rahā hũ̃ 'I' 'see' 'progressive' 'am'; 'I am seeing'). The tendency is to extend this feature to Indian English too. In the use of tenses there are several other features discussed in Kindersley (1938: 25; also quoted in Kachru 1969: 646-647).

Third, characteristics may be presented as a case of systemic variation. An often discussed illustration of such deviations is the use of articles in Indian English. (See Dustoor 1954: 1-70 and 1955: 1-17). It is not claimed here that in Indian English there is necessarily an observable "deviant" pattern in the use of articles. The picture is one of arbitrary use of the, a/an and ø article. In Dustoor (1954 and 1955) very descriptive labels have been used to categorize the Indian deviations in the use of articles, such as "Missing and intrusive articles in Indian English", and "Wrong, usurping and dispossessed articles in Indian English."

The fourth characteristic, that of the use of reduplication, is both syntactic and semantic. This entails reduplication of items belonging to various word classes. As an aside, it might be mentioned here that Indian English users share this characteristic with the users of West African English, and Black English, too. In the spoken form it is not uncommon to come across examples such as he sells different different things, I have some small small things, give them one one piece. In the written form one can provide a large number of examples from, among others, Raja Rao or Mulk Raj Anand, e.g. hot, hot coffee (C of B 1); long, long hair (C of B, 71). The reduplication is used for various syntactic and semantic reasons. In Hindi-Urdu, the reduplicated items fall into two main categories. In one category there is a choice between selecting

a reduplicated item or a non-reduplicated item. The choice of an item does not entail any semantic difference. In the second category no such choice is involved since the selection of reduplicated or non-reduplicated items do not have semantically "identical" functions. Consider, for example, the following:

(a) rām ne khāte khāte kahā ki...
Ram said while eating that...

(b) rām ne khāte hue kahā ki...
Ram said while eating that...

(c) rām ne čalte čalte kahā ki...
Ram said while walking that...

(d) rām ne čalte hue kahā ki...
Ram said while walking that...

The above (a) and (b) are understood in the same way, but there are two interpretations for (c) and (d). In Indian English reduplication is used for emphasis and to indicate continuation of a process. Raja Rao seems to use it for intensification of a situation, or to underscore an act, for example: "With these very eyes, with these very eyes, I have seen the ghosts of more than a hundred young men and women, all killed by magic, by magic..." (Javni 4).
In this example the reduplication of a phrase provides the effect of colloquial speech and also provides linguistic clues to mark a character type.

The fifth characteristic concerns the formation of interrogative constructions in which Indian English speakers do not necessarily change the position of subject and the auxiliary items. Consider, for example, What you would like to eat? or really, you are finished?. The tag-questions in Indian English also show the influence of the first languages. It is not uncommon to find either a general 'it', in all tag-questions, e.g. You have taken my book, isn't it? He has left, isn't it? or simply a negative particle in the tag question as in She borrowed my book, no?

One may also discuss here certain formations which form part of both grammar and lexis. Some of the linguistic devices used to produce such formations are very productive. I have earlier used the term INDIAN ENGLISH COLLOCATIONS for such formations (Kachru

1965, 1966, 1969, 1973, 1975a). There is no need to provide a linguistic definition of the term "collocation" here: What it refers to is the tendency of certain lexical items to keep company with a set of other lexical items. In other words, there is a mutual expectancy and a tendency of co-occurance between certain words in a language. One might say that knowledge about the constraints of mutual expectancy of lexical items forms a part of a native speaker's competence in a language. The formation silly ass in English is often given as an example of a collocation. A silly ass means more than what the two lexical items mean individually - for a native speaker of English these words signal a lot more than a four-legged animal.

The use of English in India for almost two hundred years has naturally nativized the company which English words traditionally keep in their non-Indian settings. The Indian linguistic and cultural context has either extended the membership of the set of items with which lexical items can co-occur, or new, typically Indian collocations have been formed. The Indian collocations naturally sound "foreign" to native speakers; after all, these have to be understood in terms of the Indian context (Kachru 1975). Therefore, a large number of typically Indian collocations mark Indian English as distinct from other varieties of English. Let us now examine the process involved in the Indianization of this level of the English language. There are several possibilities which might mark a collocation as Indian, either in terms of its constituent members, or in terms of its extended or restricted semantic range.

First, a collocation may deviate grammatically from the native varieties of English. A large number of Indian English collocations belong to this category, e.g., America-returned (F of F 105), England-returned (TP 166). Second, a collocation may involve loan-shifts or word-bound translations from other Indian languages, e.g. three-eyed (Kanth 209), salt-giver (e.g., so you are a traitor to your salt-givers (Kanth 32)). Third, a collocation may be contextually deviant but grammatically non deviant, e.g., bangled-widow (Kanth 233); cowdung cakes (SMH 113); eating leaves (Kanth 57);

forehead marking (MrS 266). Fourth, a collocation may not be structurally deviant but may not be productive in the native varieties of English. (e.g. sister-sleeper (V of G 130)). In native varieties of English the verb + noun construction is found in formations such as carryall, killjoy, and spitfire, but this construction is not used as a productive device (Kachru 1965: 403-405).

I have mentioned earlier in this paper the concept of interference with reference to the sound system of Indian English. The interference is not restricted to one level only; it shows in grammar, lexis, collocations and transfer of idioms from Indian languages into English. In lexis or in idioms, this process manifests itself in what is termed "translation". The translated items vary in their assimilation in the target language - the language which absorbs the items. The list of such items in Indian English is a long one. Let us consider, for example, the following: twice born (un 14) "dvija"; waist-thread (He who 190) "kaṭiḍorā"; dining-leaf (MM 84) "pattal". At first glance these items appear to be "un-English", but one can find several contextual arguments for their existence in Indian English, the most convincing one being that these formations make sense in Indian English - they have a meaning with reference to Indian culture. It is true that translated idioms sometimes stand out without being assimilated. They may even remain marginal in terms of use. But so did a marriage of convenience or it goes without saying when these were first translated from French into English. It is a rare scholar who would be curious to find out their ancestry, to identify their source. In Indian English the translated idioms may the fire of ovens consume you (C 78), a crocodile in a loin cloth (He who 217) sound rather unusual now, but there is no linguistic reason to consider them so. The formation pin drop silence appears less deviant, the reason being that we have heard it often and have used it for a long time. The following comparative constructions in Kanthapura are translations which have a typical Indian character, and convey the Indianness

which the author obviously intended to convey: as honest as an elephant (12), as good as kitchen ashes (46), helpless as a calf (55), lean as an areca-nut tree (259). A construction which is more English would perhaps sound less deviant, but then it would also be less Indian - therefore, less effective.

4.3. LEXIS:

The large compilation of Indian words entitled Hobson-Jobson (1886) has provided linguistic entertainment for generations of Indian scholars and students of Indo-British cultural, political and linguistic relations. It was, however, not the first compilation of its kind. A number of lexical lists had been compiled before Hobson-Jobson, primarily to facilitate the work of administrators involved with Indian affairs. Sir Charles Wilkin appended a glossary of such Indian words to the Fifth Report of the Select Committee submitted in 1812. A later work by Wilson (1855) entitled Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms provided the basis for Yule and Burnell's monumental compilation, Hobson-Jobson. The latest additions to this aspect of Indian English are Indian Words in English by Rao (1954), and Kachru (1975a).

Let me explain what we mean by Indian English lexis. The term "lexis" is used here roughly in the sense of "vocabulary", and refers to two characteristic types of Indian English vocabulary. A large part of the Indian English vocabulary is used essentially in Indian contexts and is restricted in use to Indian English; it is not shared with the native varieties of English, say, American or British English. The second part comprises those items which do not have such a "variety constraint" and have thus become part of the borrowed lexicons of other "Englishes" too. One might term such items "assimilated items", that is, assimilated in the lexicon of the English language. (For details see Kachru 1975a).

The earliest Indian source items to intrude into the English language were the ones used in travel literature concerning South Asia. Later, the needs of administration and the particular socio-

cultural context of India encouraged the use of such already established Indian words in Indian English. Wilson (1940: i) discussing such words, rightly says that

> Ryot and Ryotwar, for instance, suggest more precise and positive notions in connection with the subject of land revenue in the South of India, than would be conveyed by cultivator, or peasant, or agriculturist, or by an agreement for rent or revenue with the individual members of the agricultural class.

After the East India Company was firmly established in India, and communication with India was increasing, there were two attitudes toward borrowing Indian source items into the English language, namely those of linguistic purism and linguistic tolerance. (See Kachru 1975a). However, this process could not be stopped and the attitude of linguistic tolerance prevailed. As a result, we now find that various types of lexical innovations are used in Indian English. We shall discuss some of the more important innovations here. The largest body of such items involves SINGLE ITEM transfer from Indian languages into Indian English (Kachru 1975a). These are restricted in their use to India and have not yet been assimilated into American or British English. They need not be assimilated in these varieties since the contexts for their use are exclusively Indian, and are restricted to typically Indian registers of law, politics, society and newspaper writing. The second type may be termed HYBRIDIZED ITEMS. A hybridized (or mixed) formation comprises two or more lexical items, in which at least one item is from an Indian language and one from English. Consider, for example, lathi-charge (HS 15.6.59), kumkum mark (Kanth 159), tiffin carrier (DD 78), goonda ordinance (S 23.12.70). Such formations are further divided into "open set hybrid items" and "closed set hybrid items" (Kachru 1975a, section 3.2). An open set item does not have any grammatical constraints on the selection of the members of a hybridized item (e.g. kumkum mark). On the other hand, a closed system item has certain grammatical constraints, e.g. -wala in policewala (SMH 61), -hood in Brahminhood,

-dom in colliedom and -ism in goondaism. (For discussion on "Types of Hybrid Innovations" see Kachru 1975a, section 3.3.1.) There are several other observations one might make about such formations. In a linguistically pluralistic context we find that some hybridized items are actually reduplications; these combine items from two languages, but each (individual) item has the same or at least a related meaning in its source language e.g. lathistick (Kanth 210), cotton kapas (Mail 1.1.59), curved kukri (SIF 61). There are also some formations which may start as "area bound" and then slowly cross the language boundary into another language area, e.g. coconut paysam (AD 8), jibba pocket (WM 19), and potato bonda (WM 222) are essentially South Indian. On the other hand, yakka carriage (BH 55) religious diwan (IN 12.6.59), and dadan money (HS 11.6.59) are essentially North Indian.

The hybridized formations function in varied semantic areas and have a wide range of contextual distribution. We shall consider some of them below.

Administration: mofussil town (1000 Nights 69); police thana (SMH 85); taluk office (AD 61);

Agriculture: akkullu paddy (M 1.1.59); kharif season (OR 15.7.59); taccavi loan (HT 1.9.58);

Animals: basavana bull (S&R 293); dhaman snake (MM 201); Jantri bird (F of F 53);

Articles of use: attar bottle (S&R 266); chit-book (RH 71); tiffin carrier (V of G 19);

Art/Music: nautch girl (S&R 289), senai music (MM 72), veena solo (RH 205);

Buidlings: dak bungalow (TP 56), durbar hall (AD 224) panchayat hall (Kanth 116);

Clothing: choli-piece (S&R 58), durbar turban (Kanth 167), himru jacket (S&R 349);

Edibles/drinks: coconut paysam (AD 8), onion-pacoras (RH 171), potato bonda (WM 222);

Evaluation (attitude): babu mentality (IN 3.12.60) sarkari spy (BH 51), vilayati fashion (BH 185);
Modes of Address/Reference: ahimsa soldier (WM 78), college babu (F of F 253), police jamadar (Kanth 29);
Money/banking: anna-coin (AD 123), copper pie (SMH 91), pice-worth (S'tH 161);
Occupations: beediseller (AD 52), Jutka driver (BA 101), sherbat dealer (BH 34);
Place names: kutchery road (BH 54), mela ground (HS 11.6.59), thothi house (Kanth 19);
Politics: congress pandal (Un 212), kisan candidate (V of G 13), swatantra party (FPJ 11.6.59);
Religion/Rituals: aroti ceremony (He Who 113), sankrati fair (Hit 28.12.59), yoga exercise (H in A 29);
Social (general): communal hookah (1000 Nights), sindur mark (MM 99), zenana affair (F of F 66);
Speech/language: angrezi-speech (no citation), babu English (S&R 33);
Trees/flowers: darbha-grass (S&R 194), gold mohar (1000 Nights), kunda blossom (MM 106);
Vehicles: janta express (Hit 30.12.59), rail gade (BH 75), yakka stand (BH 60);

A reader interested in this aspect of Indian English will find detailed lists and discussions in the following works, among others: Yule and Burnell (1886), Wilson (1940 [1885]), Rao (1954) and Kachru (1975a).

4.4. SEMANTICS:

The Indian semantic features of the Indian variety of English may be characterized as (a) semantic restriction of English words; (b) semantic extension of English words; (c) archaisms which have been preserved in Indian English and are no longer current in the native varieties of English; (d) register-shifts which involve the use of items without register constraints in Indian English; and

(e) contextual redefinition of lexical items.

In order to account for semantic restriction and extension (above a and b), the Indian English lexicon has to assign [+] and/or [-] Indian semantic features to such items. The lexical items may either be from an Indian source language (e.g. ahimsa, satyagraha) or English (e.g. cousin-sister). (For a detailed discussion see Kachru 1975a). The Indian source items borrowed in Indian English undergo an interesting semantic restriction. Consider the following observation (Kachru 1975a: 66):

> In the SAE [South Asian English] texts which I examined, the item *purdah* (in Indian and Pakistani English) preceded only *-women, -system, -lady*. It therefore is register-restricted in SAE and has a limited semantic range as it occurs only in one register. On the other hand, in Hindi-Urdu *purdah* does not have any such register-restriction. Consider, among others, the following contexts in which it occurs: *drapes; curtain* (of a movie or theatre); *screen; hindrance; veil; wall; layers; oar; fret* (of a musical instrument such as a guitar). In addition to these, it may also be used in the following fixed collocations: *pardā khōlnā* 'to expose a secret'; *pardā dālnā* 'to cover a secret or an act'; *pardā rahnā* 'to remain unexposed', *pardā lagānā* 'to remain under the veil' and *parde mẽ bɛṭhnā* 'to remain under protection'. In SAE it has only one semantic marker and no idiomatic uses.

An item is considered an "archaism" if it is no longer used in the same sense in the native varieties of English (cf. the use of bosom in Indian English). The register-shift may involve items from one or more of the above categories. Consider, for example, the following items which have high frequency of use both in spoken and written Indian English, communal, interdine, intermarriage. These items involve a register shift and also "contextual redefinition" in the sociocultural and linguistic context of India. (See Kachru 1973.)

4.5. INTELLIGIBILITY OF INDIAN ENGLISH:

At this point, since we have already briefly discussed some illustrations of the Indianness of Indian English at various linguistic levels, it may be appropriate to pause and ask two questions. First, in spite of regional and language-bound variations, is Indian English intelligible to Indians all over the subcontinent? Second, is Indian English intelligible to the educated native speakers of English, say for example, from America or Britain? As I have stated elsewhere (Kachru 1976), very little and superficial empirical research has been done concerning the intelligibility of non-native varieties of English. It is an extremely fertile area for research, but has yet to attract the serious attention of theoretical and applied linguists.

In answer to the first question, on the basis of experience, one can claim that 'standard', or 'educated' Indian English has pan-Indian intelligibility. That does not mean, however, that an educated Indian speaker of English does not reveal some regional characteristics in his speech. These characteristics are of the same nature as one may find in the speech, for example, of an educated American or British speaker of English.

In the written medium several pan-Indian registers, such as the administrative and legal registers, have already developed. These are distinctly Indian in their lexical and (some) grammatical characteristics. One also notices in English newspapers regional lexical innovations, and other formations, which are language-bound and are transferred to English due to the influence of the mother tongue. In order to find such formations one has, for example, to only look through, even casually, The Mail in Madras, The Amrita Bazar Patrika in Calcutta, Tribune in Ambala or the Search Light in Patna.

The intelligibility of Indian English by native speakers forms a cline. Some Indians are fully intelligible and others are less intelligible. This again is an area in which very little empirical

research has been done. In his study, Bansal (1969) has presented some results which are relevant to this question. In the following table I have summarized the main conclusions of his study. It presents the results of tests for measuring intelligibility between the speakers of the following varieties of English: (i) Indian English speakers and native speakers of American English and received pronunication; (ii) Indian English speakers and other non-native speakers of English-Germans and Nigerians; (iii) Indian English speakers with other Indian English speakers.

The Intelligibility of Indian English (Test Results)

	Participants in test	Highest%	Lowest%	Average
1.	Indian English & RP speakers (group)	73	67	70
2.	Indian English & RP speakers (cline of intelligibility)	95	53	
3.	Indian English & American English speakers	81	72	74
4.	Indian English & German speakers	67	40	57
5.	Indian English speakers & Nigerians	66	34	53
6.	Indian English speakers with other Indian English speakers	88	54	74
7.	RP speakers with other RP speakers	100	95	97

The highest and the average figures in the above table are of interest. It is evident that an educated Indian speaker of English maintains his Indianness and has not cultivated what Firth (1960: [reprinted 1966: 196]) would consider

> ...a shameful negative English which effectually masks social and local origin and is a suppression of all that is vital in speech.

5.0. INDIAN ENGLISH LITERATURE:

The growth and development of INDIAN ENGLISH LITERATURE was earlier viewed with considerable scepticism, and its literary merit and contribution as an Indian literature was discussed with great cynicism. In recent years, however, especially after the 1950's, it seems the attitude towards Indian English and evaluation of its literary contribution have undergone a change both in India and also in other English speaking countries. This changed attitude is succinctly summed up in Iyengar's following observation (1962: 3).

> ....Indian writing in English is but one of the voices in which India speaks. It is a new voice, no doubt, but it is as much Indian as others.

In the long literary tradition of India, the only other language which acquired a pan-Indian literary tradition was Sanskrit, and, much later and to a smaller extent, Indian Persian, primarily in the north of India. In recent years the Hindi language has been aspiring to such a role, but its national impact has not been of the same degree as that of Indian English. It should, however, be mentioned here that in India there are only three literatures which have a pan-Indian reading public - although numerically very small --Indian English, Hindi and Sanskrit.

By the term INDIAN ENGLISH LITERATURE (or WRITING) is meant the fast-growing body of literature which is written by Indians using English as their second language. As a minor digression it may be mentioned here that in this respect the English language is unique among the present world languages. In the last three or four decades, a considerable body of creative writing has developed in English which is written by non-native users of the language, especially in West Africa, the Phillipines, and South Asia. (For a detailed discussion see Bailey 1973 and Ramchand 1970.) Indian English literature is thus an important constituent of the "new Englishes" which have develcped in the Commonwealth countries and other parts of the world.[7]

A brief discussion of the term INDIAN ENGLISH LITERATURE may not be inappropriate here, especially since this term is not unanimously accepted. There has been considerable polemic argumentation concerning a name for this body of writing. The use of various names with various implications has resulted in some confusion, too. I shall, therefore, discuss some of these labels here. The term ANGLO-INDIAN writing is used with reference to that body of creative writing which focuses on the Indian sub-continent as the central theme, and is written by those who use English as their first language, e.g. E. M. Foster, Rudyard Kipling, John Masters. The Anglo-Indian writers are not to be confused with the Indian ethnic group with this name. The contribution of this group of writers is linguistically interesting for two reasons: They coined many contextually deviant collocations in English which are relevant to the Indian sociocultural and political context, and they borrowed a number of words from South Asian languages into English. This was primarily done to add what is termed "local colour" to their writings. A detailed critical evaluation of such writing from a literary point is given in Oaten (1908) and Singh (1934). The awkward-sounding and semantically confusing term INDO-ANGLIAN writing is used for the work of "...those who are Indian and who have written in English" (Mukherjee 1971: 15). It was during World War II that the term INDO-ANGLICAN gained currency; in recent literature, fortunately, it is not used too often. Another term, INDO-ENGLISH, was alternately used with Indo-Anglican, but on the whole now the battle of terms seems to have subsided in favour of the self-explanatory and less confusing INDIAN ENGLISH WRITING (or INDIAN WRITING IN ENGLISH). In certain circles the hesitation to use this term is primarily attitudinal. The modifier Indian with English seems to imply a second class status for some scholars; in linguistic literature this term has, however, been in use for a long time, though not always with desirable attitudinal connotations. (See Kachru 1969: 654-55).

The short history of Indian English literature has been one of controversy and schizophrenia in identity (Lal 1969). Indian creative writers who write in languages other than English suspect the integrity of writers who use an "alien" language for creative purposes. Writers in other English-speaking countries treat them as marginal to the mainstream of English literature. But in spite of these controversies in recent years, especially after Indian independence, Indian English literature has steadily grown in various literary forms, e.g. fiction (Mukherjee 1971), poetry (Iyengar 1962, especially 427-31; Lal 1969 i-xliv), essays (Iyengar 1971: 344-69) and journalism (Rau, 1974). Political writing in English in India dates back to Rammohan Roy (1772-1833) and continued with renewed vigor during the struggle for Indian independence.

In the 1930's the attitude toward Indian English writing was much different from what it is today. In 1934 Singh (1934: 306) commented:

> Indian writers and story-tellers on the whole do not compare favourably with Anglo-Indian writers. That they write in a foreign tongue is a serious handicap in itself. Then few of them possess any knowledge of the art of fiction... In plot construction they are weak, and in characterization weaker still.

On the other hand, the following comments of Gokak (1964: 162) present the recent assessment of Indian English writers.

> Indo-Anglican writing is direct and spontaneous - like creative writing in any other language. It is conditioned in many ways by the peculiar circumstances of its birth and growth...Gordon Bottomley is said to have described typically Indo-Anglican poetry as 'Matthew Arnold in a sari.' He should rather have referred to it as Shakuntala in skirts.

A historical study of Indian English literature with critical comments is present in the following works, among others Iyengar (1943 and 1962), McCutchion (1968) and Mukherjee (1971). In the last decade several anthologies of poems have also been published (e.g. Deshpande 1974; Gokak 1970; Nandy 1973; Saha 1971).

Indian English fiction is now being studied and discussed in the whole English-speaking world by those interested in the Indian subcontinent, the Third world Englishes, and by linguists for its thematic and stylistic Indianness. At least half a dozen Indian English novelists have created a small but slowly increasing international reading public for themselves e.g. Mulk Raj Anand (See Sinha 1972); Manohar Malgonkar (See Amur 1973); R. K. Narayan (See Holmstrom 1973 and Sundram 1973); Raja Rao (See Naik 1972); Khushwant Singh (See Shahane 1972) and Nayantara Sehgal.

The position of Indian English poets seems to be rather precarious. The Bengali poet and critic Buddhadeva Bose does not present just his own opinion when he says:

> It may seem surprising that Indians, who have always had a firm poetic tradition in their own languages, should ever have tried to write verse in English. That they did so was an outcome of the Anglomania which seized some upper class Indians in the early years of British rule. (Quoted in Lal 1969: 3-4).

In the same note, entitled "Indian Poetry in English", Bose refers to the present scene:

> There are still a few Indians (both parents natives) who claim English to be their "best" language. What circumstances led to this inconceivable loss of a mother-tongue, or whether they had abjured it voluntarily, cannot be ascertained...

Then discussing their reading public, Bose continues:

> The fact is that the "Indo-Anglians" do not have a real public in India, where literature is defined in terms of the different native languages, and their claim can be justified only by appreciation in England or the United States.

Bose then concludes with an often quoted reminder of Yeats:

> As late as 1937, Yeats reminded Indian writers that "No man can think or write with music and vigour except in his mother tongue"; to the great majority of Indians this admonition was unnecessary, but the intrepid few who left it unheeded do not yet realize that "Indo-Anglian" poetry is a blind alley, lined with Curio Shops, leading nowhere.

This is, of course, one view, an extreme view. This argument has been presented against the Indian English writers for a long time now. A very stimulating discussion on Bose's paper is presented in Lal (1969), and provides an over-view of Indian English poetry and the reactions of several poets toward Bose's position (See especially i-xliv and 3-7).

The tradition of Indian English poetry is not recent; it goes back to, among others, Sri Aurobindo (1872-1950), Manmohan Ghose (1869-1924), Toru Dutt (1857-77), and Sarojini Naidu (1879-1949). In Bhushan (1945a and 1945b) and Gokak 1970) a number of other poets are mentioned. In the last five years several anthologies of such poetry and a number of single collections of poems have been published. The Writers Workshop, founded in Calcutta in 1958, has made available a large number of such collections.

> It [the Workshop] consists of a group of writers who agree in principle that English has proved its ability, as a language, to play a creative role in Indian literature, through original writing and transcreation (Lal 1969: 596).

The number of Indian English poets is fast growing and their poetic output varies from half a dozen poems to several collections. One can mention the following, among others, as representative poets: Nissim Ezekiel (b. 1924), P. Lal (b. 1931),R. Parthasarthy (b. 1934), and A. K. Ramanujan (b. 1929).

The post-independence period has initiated a split among the Indian writers in English living on the two sides of the sea. This has resulted in

> ....two different, and sometimes even hostile, streams: the Aliens and the Indigenous writers.... the Aliens (who often retain Indian nationality but prefer to stay abroad for a complex variety of reasons, chief among them being the advantage of living in close proximity to "pure" English, U-English, and of finding a reasonably well-paying market for their work), are in the final count, contributing to the tradition of English literature, while the Indigenous writers are adding to the spectrum of Indian literature, (Lal 1969: xviii-xix).

This point of view, of course, is not shared by all.

The use of Indian English has increased in other genres too, e.g. essays, political writing and newspaper writing (Iyengar 1962). In recent years, contrary to the earlier cynicism of some Indians and non-Indians, Indian English writing has substantially increased, its quality and range has improved, and it has established itself as one of the Indian literatures. It is now being accepted and recognized both in India and in the English speaking world as a whole.

6.0. ENGLISH IN INDIA'S LANGUAGE PLANNING:

In the post-independence era of India, the role of English has varied from one state to another. Education and educational policy are controlled by the states, and not by the central government - each state determines its own educational policy. However, in spite of the regional differences in the role of English in the school system, English is taught in all the states of India as the main second language. The total number of years for the teaching of English, and the stages at which a child may be exposed to bilingualism in English are not identical in all the states. By and large, there has been less argumentation, vacillation and change in the role of English in the central government. Each serious move to reduce the use of English in the central government and replace it with Hindi has resulted in opposition from some southern states. The policy, therefore, seems to be to continue the status quo.

In present language planning in India, as in other linguistically and culturally pluralistic societies, various political, cultural and social considerations determine the position of English at the state level or at the national level. There are primarily three questions which continue to be asked and discussed and to which no generally acceptable answers have yet been found. The first question is obviously about the position which English should be

assigned in early education and in higher education. The second question, not unrelated to the first one, is what the roles of the regional language, Hindi, and English should be. The third question, which concerns English educators, is which model of English should be presented to Indian learners of the language, and how that presentation can be made uniformly and effectively. The answers to these questions are still being sought.

The Government of India has been primarily concerned with the first two questions, since these are directly related to language planning both at the national level and at the state level. The language question became an explosive national problem and the government of India has initiated various efforts to probe into this problem. The most important efforts in this direction are listed below. Any discussion toward finding a generally acceptable solution to the language question invariably involves the present and future role of English in India. After 1947, the first important step in looking into the overall language question of India was the appointment of the Official Language Commission by the President of India on June 7, 1955 under the Chairmanship of B. G. Kher. It was the duty of the Commission to make recommendations to the President as to:

> (a) the progressive use of the Hindi language for the official purposes of the Union; (b) restrictions on the use of the English language for all or any of the official purposes of the Union; (c) the language to be used for all or any of the purposes mentioned in Article 348 of the Constitution; (d) the form of numerals to be used for any one or more specified purposes of the Union; (e) the preparation of a time schedule according to which and the manner in which Hindi may gradually replace English as the official language of the Union and as a language for communication between the Union and State Governments and between the State Government and another.... (See Report of the Official Language Commission, hereafter ROLC, 1956: 1)

The Report provides an excellent document for the study of two basic views on the future role of English in India. One was represented by Suniti Kumar Chatterji (see his Note of Dissent in ROLC 1956: 271-314) and P. Subbarayan (see his Minute of Dissent in ROLC 1956: 315-30). The other view was represented by other members on the Commission (see ROLC 1956). This is a monumental Report on India's language question, and the future of English in various roles is discussed in detail.

According to Article 343 (2) of the Indian Constitution, the English language was to be used for all official purposes of the Union till January 26, 1965. The Constitution (Article 343 (1)) specified that after this date Hindi was to be the official language. But due to the language controversy (and riots) in various parts of the country, especially in Tamil Nadu in May 1963, Parliament passed the Official Language Act. According to this Act, the English language was to continue even after the expiry of fifteen years as an additional language with Hindi for purposes of the Union and for use in Parliament. In order to reassure the non-Hindi groups, the Official Languages (Amendment) Act was passed in 1967. The Act specifies that

> Notwithstanding the expiration of the period of fifteen years from the commencement of the Constitution, the English language may, as from the appointed day, continue to be used, in addition to Hindi, for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before that day, and for the transaction of business in Parliament.

In the last two decades several commissions have been appointed by various agencies for the study of the functions of English in India, and the reorganization of the curriculum at the school and university levels. We shall briefly discuss some of the more important reports here. In 1950 and 1951 The Report of the University Education Commission was published. The Commission was headed by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan. This report presents an indepth evaluation

and planning for Indian education (for the role of English see especially 316-26). The following observations concerning English are relevant to this study. With reference to the past role of English in India the Report says (316):

> Now it is true that the English language has been one of the potent factors in the development of unity in the country. In fact, the concept of nationality and the sentiment of nationalism are largely the gifts of the English language and literature to India.
> ...English has become so much a part of our national habit that a plunge into an altogether different system seems attended with unusual risks. It appears to us, however, that the plunge is inevitable. English cannot continue to occupy the place of state language as in the past. Use of English as such divides the people into two nations, the few who govern and the many who are governed, the one unable to talk the language of the other, and mutually uncomprehending. This is a negation of democracy.

Concerning the future role of English it says that "we must take into account our Yugadharma" and, therefore recommends (326):

> That English be studied in High Schools and in the universities in order that we may keep in touch with the living stream of ever-growing knowledge.

In 1955, the University Grants Commission appointed a Committee, under the Chairmanship of H. N. Kunzru. The Kunzru Committee, as it is called, submitted its report in December 1957. The important recommendations of the Kunzru Committee are summarized in a later report as follows. (See Report of the English Review Committee, 1965: 39).

> (a) That the change from English to an Indian language as the medium of instruction at the university stage should not be hastened.
>
> (b) That even when a change in the medium of instruction is made, English should continue to be studied by all university students.
>
> (c) That it would be necessary to have textbooks prepared on scientific principles and that the Government of India

or the Council of Secondary Education should take up this question for consideration.

(d) That in relation to the Three Year Degree course which is now proposed to be introduced in our universities the teaching of English be given special attention in the pre-university class.

(e) That the teaching of English literature should be related to the study of Indian literatures, so that apart from its value for linguistic purposes, it could be an effective means of stimulating critical thinking and writing in the Indian languages.

(f) That it is desirable to have the question of courses of study in English and methods of teaching English at the university stage examined by an expert body and the recommendations of that body adopted by all the universities.

(g) That where English is not the medium of instruction at any university it is necessary to adopt special methods to secure an adequate knowledge of English as a second language.

(h) That far greater attention should be given to linguistics in our universities and in our teacher training colleges.

(i) That it is in our educational interest that English should be retained as a properly studied second language in our universities even when an Indian language is used as the ordinary medium of teaching.

The recommendations of the Kunzru Commission were presented before a conference of English teachers in 1958 at the Central Institute of English in Hyderabad. The recommendations of this conference were primarily concerned with methods, curriculum and textbooks. In February 1960, the University Grants Commission appointed a Committee of Experts under the Chairmanship of G. C. Banerjee to examine the issues involved in the teaching of English. The Committee was to consider the following (Report of the English Review Committee 1965: 4):

(a) To define the objectives of teaching and learning English at the various levels of university education.

(b) To examine the standards of teaching in English language and literature both at the undergraduate and post graduate levels.

(c) To examine the methods of teaching English used in our universities and colleges to equip students with the minimum competence required in this regard in the shortest possible time.

(d) To consider measures for reorganizing the M.A. course in English to provide for an intensive study of the language as a tool of knowledge rather that of literature.

(e) To recommend the steps that may be taken to strengthen the teaching of English in the context of the medium of instruction in the universities.

The recommendations of the Committee of Experts are not any more insightful than were the recommendations of earlier committees. This Report, however, presents another phase in the activity toward breaking the teaching of English away from the earlier approaches, goals and curricula. In addition to these there have been several other commissions and committees which directly or indirectly looked into the question of the role of English in India's language planning.[8]

In the 1960's it was enthusiastically felt by many that at last a solution to India's language problem had been found in what was termed the THREE LANGUAGE FORMULA. It involved learning three languages, namely the regional language, Hindi and English. In the so-called Hindi area, it was expected that the study of a Dravidian language would be encouraged, since in that area Hindi would be identical with the regional language. This formula has, however, not been accepted with equal enthusiasm in all the States of the Union. In the Madhya-deśa, 'Central India', the so-called Hindi area, the teaching of a Dravidian language - to balance the language-load carried by all the school going children throughout the nation - was not taken seriously. In recent execution of a language planning policy in India, the main focus of hostility

has become Hindi. The attitude towards English has been one of vacillation and uncertainty.

The current literature on language planning in India and the various languages in Indian Education provides the viewpoints and attitudes of the following groups: First, the Union Ministry of Education. The policies of the Union Ministry are not always acceptable to the State governments. Second, Indian English writers (Lal 1969: i-xliv), who have organized themselves in various regional and national groups. Third, the anti-English groups which include the supporters of Hindi and also the supporters of regional languages. However, in certain states the supporters of the regional languages are not necessarily the supporters of Hindi, e.g. in Tamilnadu and Bengal. Fourth, the English-knowing elite who are traditionally pro-English and have played a very vocal role in the debate on the role of English in India. This group also includes ethnic groups such as the Anglo-Indians, who identify themselves with the English language and sometimes even claim it to be their mother tongue (Spencer 1966). Whatever the controversies and attitudes toward the future of English in India, one thing is certain: that the diffusion of bilingualism in English, creative use of it in the country, and use of it as a pan-Indian link language has continued during the post-independence years.[9]

7.0. CONCLUSION:

The post-independence era in India has brought the language controversy to the forefront. In this controversy the English language has been the main focus of the argumentation. There is already a substantial body of literature which presents the various views on this controversy. (For details see Ahmad, 1941, Shah 1968). This era has also been the most productive period for Indian English literature. It is during this period that this body of literature has acquired the status of an Indian literature. The Sahitya Academi (National Academy of Letters) has awarded several annual prizes to Indian English writers, and various journals have appeared

which are specially devoted to such writing, for example Miscellany (Calcutta), and Journal of Indian Writing in English (Gulbarga). A number of contributions have also appeared on such writing in, among others, Literary Criterion (Mysore), Literary Half-Yearly (Mysore), The Indian P.E.N. (Bombay), Quest (Bombay).

Research on various aspects of English and English literature has finally caught the attention of Indian academicians and universities (Kachru 1975b). The change in their attitudes and perspectives is obvious in various writings (See, for example, Lal 1969).

The earlier focus on research on English in Indian universities is changing. A realistic attitude has developed which is significantly different from the earlier tradition of research in universities. A recent survey provides some insights into this changing attitude and disillusionment (Kachru 1975b).

NOTES

This study is a slightly modified version of a paper entitled "Indian English" which is to appear in Bh. Krishnamurti (ed.) Introduction to Indian Languages and Linguistics, National Book Trust, India, New Delhi. The outline for the organization of various sections in this paper was provided by the editor of the volume in order to maintain uniformity in all the papers written by various authors. The overall structure of the original paper has been retained.

1. A detailed discussion of the theoretical and language-specific aspects of interference is given in U. Weinreich, Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems, Mouton, The Hague, 1966.

2. See Distribution of Languages in India in States and Union Territories (Inclusive of Mother-tongues), Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, 1973 p. v. The "family affiliations" of these languages is as follows: Unclassified 601; Indo-Aryan 532; Austric 53; Dravidian 148; and Tibeto-Chinese 227. This list also includes 9 languages of Sikkim which brings the total to 1,652.

3. See, for details, Universities Handbook, 1973, Interuniversity Board of India, New Delhi, especially pp. 965-968.

4. The statistical information of the newspapers and periodicals presented in the study is based on Press in India 1974, 18th Annual Report of the Registrar of Newspapers for India, Part I, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1975.

5. In India the British manner of speech was considered prestigious and was normally the goal of a western-educated Indian. This goal was very rarely, if ever, attained, except by a selected few. A recent survey has shown that even now the British

model of English is preferred by educated Indians over the Indian or American Models of English (See Kachru, 1976).

6. One can provide a large number of such examples from Indian English newspapers or the administrative register, too.

7. The language contact in India has resulted in a two-eay linguistic impact. On the one hand the Indian languages and literatures have influenced the foreign ('imposed') languages, the result of which is Indian Persian or Indian English. On the other hand, the foreign languages have substantially influenced the Indian languages and literatures (See Kachru, 1975c).

8. The following reports also discuss the place of English in Indian education and the problems in the teaching of English: Report of the Secondary Education Commission, Ministry of Education, The Manager of Publications, Government of India, New Delhi, 1965 (Chairman, A. L. Mudaliar); Report of the Education Commission (Education and National Development) Ministry of Education, New Delhi, The Manager of Publications, Government of India, New Delhi, 1966 (Chairman, D. S. Kothari); this report recommended: "As English will, for a long time to come, continue to be needed as a 'library language' in the field of higher education, a strong foundation in the language will have to be laid at the school stage." (p. 197); The Study of English in India; Report of a Study Group, Ministry of Education, New Delhi, The Manager of Publications, Government of India, New Delhi, 1967 (Chairman, V. K. Gokak); Report of the Committee on Colleges, University Grants Commission, New Delhi, 1967; National Policy on Education, Ministry of Education, New Delhi, The Manager of Publications, Government of India, New Delhi, 1968; Proceedings of the Conference on the Methodology of Teaching Indian languages as Second languages in Secondary Schools, Ministry of Education, The Manager of Publications, Government of India, New Delhi,1969 (Chairman, G. K. Chandramani) See especially pp. 27-44; Teaching of English: Report of the Study Group, Ministry of Education and Youth Services, The

Manager of Publications, New Delhi, 1971 (Chairman, V. K. Gokak); Governance of Universities: Report of the Committee on Governance of Universities and Colleges Part I, University Grants Commission, New Delhi, 1971.

9. In this study, citations from Indian English texts are taken from the publications listed below; they are identified by abbreviations given in the parenthesis after each title. The place of publication is London unless otherwise indicated.

I. BOOKS

K. A. Abbas, *One Thousand Nights on a Bed of Stone*, Bombay, n.d. (*1000 Nights*); M. R. Anand, *Untouchable*, 1935 (*Un*), *Coolie*, 1936 (*C*), *The Big Heart*, 1947 (*BH*); P. Bhattacharya, *So Many Hungers*, 1959 (*SMH*), *Music for Mohini*, 1959 (*MM*), *He Who Rides a Tiger*, 1960 (*He Who*); S. N. Ghosh, *The Flame of the Forest*, 1955 (*F of F*); A. Lall, *The House in Adampur: A Study of Modern India*, 1959 (*H in A*); K. Markandaya, *Some Inner Fury*, 1955 (*SIF*); R. K. Narayan, *The Astrologer's Day, and Other Stories*, 1947 (*AD*), *Mr. Sampath*, 1952 (*MrS*), *Waiting for the Mahatma*, 1955 (*WM*); B. Rajan, *The Dark Dancer*, 1958 (*DD*); Raja Rao, *Kanthapura*, 1938 (*Kanth*), *The Cow of the Barricades and other stories*, 1947 (*C of B*), *The Serpent and the Rope*, 1960 (*S & R*); K. Singh, *Train To Pakistan*, 1956 (*TP*), *The Voice of God*, Bombay, n.d. (*V of G*), S. R. Rau, *Remember the House*, 1956 (*RH*).

II. NEWSPAPERS

Hindustan Standard, Calcutta; *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi (*HT*); *Hitwada*, Nagpur (*Hit*); *Free Press Journal*, Bombay (*FPJ*); *Indian News* (*IN*); *Link*, New Delhi (*L*); *The Mail*, Madras (*M*); *Statesman*, New Delhi (*S*).

III. PERIODICALS

Orissa Review (*OR*) Bhubaneshwar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following items provide references and selected bibliography. For an exhaustive general bibliography see A Bibliography of Indian English, Central Institute of English & Foreign Languages, Hyderabad, 1972; for language and linguistically-oriented research on Indian English see Kachru 1969: 660-678. An updated version of this has appeared in Joshua Fishman ed., Advances in Multilingualism, The Hague, Mouton, 1976; see also Karaka 1974 and Spencer 1960.

Ahmad, Z. A. 1941. National Language for India. Allahabad. Kitabistan.

Alphonse-Karkala, John B. 1964. Indo-English literature in the Nineteenth Century. Ph.D. dissertation. Columbia University.

Amur, G. S. 1973. Manohar Malgonkar. New Delhi. Arnold-Heinemann India.

Bailey, Richard W. and J. L. Robinson. 1973. Varieties of Present-Day English. New York. Macmillan.

Bansal, R. K. 1966. The Intelligibility of Indian English: Measurements of the intelligibility of connected speech and sentence and word material presented to listeners of different nationalities. Ph.D. thesis. University of London.

_____ 1969. Intelligibility of Indian English. Hyderabad. Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages.

Bhushan, V. N. ed. 1945a. The moving finger. Bombay. Padma Publishers.

_____. 1945b. The Peacock Lute. Bombay. Padma Publishers.

A Bibliography of Indian English. 1972. Hyderabad. Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages.

Clive, John. 1973. Macaulay: The Shaping of the Historian. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Desai, S. K. ed. 1974. Experimentation with language in Indian Writing in English (Fiction) Kolhapur. Department of English. Shivaji University.

Deshpande, Gauri ed. 1974. An Anthology of Indo-English poetry. Delhi. Hind Pocket Books.

Duff, Alexander. 1837. New era of the English language and English literature in India. Edinburgh.

Dustoor, P. E. 1954. Missing and intrusive articles in Indian English. Allahabad University Studies 31: 1-70.

_____. 1955. Wrong, usurping and dispossessed articles in Indian English. Allahabad University Studies 32: 1-17.

Firth, J. R. 1930. [reprinted 1966] Speech: London. Oxford University Press.

Goffin, R. C. 1934. Some Notes on Indian English. S.P.E. Tract No. 41. Oxford.

Gokak, V. K. 1964. English in India: Its Present and Future. Bombay. Asia Publishing House.

_____, ed. 1970. The Golden Treasury of Indo-Anglian Poetry. New Delhi. Sahitya Akademi.

Gopalkrishnan, G. S. 1960. Some observations on the South Indian pronunciation of English. Teaching English. 6:2: 62-67.

Harry, P. 1962. A Study of Spoken Gujarati in its Relation to the Teaching of English to Gujarati Learners. Unpublished paper. School of Applied Linguistics. University of Edinburgh.

Holmstrom, Lakshmi. 1973. The Novels of R. K. Narayan. Calcutta. Writers Workshop.

Iyengar, K. R. 1943. Indo-Anglian literature. Bombay. International Book House.

_____. 1962. Indian Writing in English. New York. Asia Publishing House.

Kachru, Braj B. 1965. The Indianness in Indian English. Word 21: 301-410.

_____. 1966. Indian English: A study in contextualization. In Memory of J. R. Firth. ed. by C. E. Bazell et.al. London. Longmans.

_____. 1969. English in South Asia. Current Trends in Linguistics. vol. V South Asia. T. A. Sebeok ed. The Hague. Mouton.

_____. 1970. Some style features of South Asian English. National Identity, ed. by K. Goodwin. London. Heinemann.

_____. 1973. Toward a lexicon of Indian English in Issues in Linguistics, Braj B. Kachru et.al. eds. Urbana. University of Illinois Press.

_____. 1975a. Lexical innovations in South Asian English. International Journal of the Sociology of Language. Vol.4.

_____. 1975b. A retrospective study of the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages and its relation to Indian universities. In Fox 1975: 27-94.

_____. 1975c. (to appear). The Englishization of Hindi: Language Rivalry and Language change. In I. Rauch et.al. eds. Linguistic Method: Papers in Honour of Herbert Penzl. The Hague. de Ridder Press.

_____. 1976. Models of English for the Third World, White man's Linguistic Burden or Language Pragmatics? TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 10, No. 2.

Karkala, John A. and Leena. 1974. Bibliography of Indo-English Literature: A checklist of works by Indian Authors in English, 1800-1966. Bombay. Nirmala Sadanand Publishers.

Karnani, Chetan. 1974. Nissim Ezekiel. New Delhi. Arnold Heinemann.

Kelkar, A. D. 1957. Marathi English: A study in foreign accent. Word 13:2 266-82.

Lal, P. and R. Rao eds. 1959. Modern Indo-Anglian Poetry. Calcutta. Writers Workshop.

_____. 1968. The Concept of Indian Literature: Six essays. Calcutta. Writers Workshop.

_____. 1969. Modern Indian Poetry in English. Calcutta. Writers Workshop.

Law, N. N. 1915. Promotion of learning in India by early European settlers. London.

McCutchion, David. 1968. Indian Writing in English: Critical essays. Calcutta. Writer's Workshop.

Mehta, P. P. 1968. Indo-Anglian Fiction: An Assessment. Bareilly. Prakash Book Depot.

Mencken, H. L. 1941. [Reprinted 1963] The American Language. London Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mokashi-Punekar. (Shankar) The Indo-Anglian Creed. 1973. Calcutta. Writer's Workshop.

Morris, E. E. 1898. Austral English. London: Macmillan.

Mukherjee, Meenakshi. 1971. The Twice Born Fiction: Themes and Techniques of the Indian Novel in English. New Delhi & London. Heinemann.

Naik, M. K. ed. 1969. Critical essays on Indian Writing in English. Dharwar. Karnatak University.

_____. 1972. Raja Rao. New York, Twayne Publishers, Inc.

_____. 1973. Mulk Raj Anand. New Delhi. Arnold-Heinemann. India.

Nandy, P. ed. 1973. Indian poetry in English Today. New Delhi. Sterling Publishers Pvt.

Narasimhaiah, C. D. 1969. The Swan and the Eagle. Simla. Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

Narayan, Shyamala A. 1973. Sudhin N. Ghosh. New Delhi. Arnold-Heinemann. India.

Nicholson, Kai, 1972. A Presentation of Social Problems in the Indo-Anglian & the Anglo-Indian Novel. Bombay. Jaico Publishing House.

Oaten, F. F. 1908. A Sketch of Anglo-Indian Literature. London.

Peeradina, Saleem ed. 1972. Contemporary Indian Poetry in English: An assessment and selection. Bombay. Macmillan India.

Prater, Clifford. 1966. The British Heresy in TESL. In J. Fishman et.al. Language Problems in Developing Nations. New York. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Quirk, Randolph. 1972. Linguistic bonds across the Atlantic. The English Language and Images of Matter. London: Oxford University Press.

Rajeev, T. and Belliappa, M. 1966. The Poetry of Nissim Ezekiel. Calcutta. Writer's Workshop.

Ramchand, Kenneth. 1970. The language of the master? Bailey 1973 115-146.

Ransom, W. S. 1966. Australian English: An Historical Study of Vocabulary 1788-1898. Canberra.

Rao, A. V. Krishna. 1972. The Indo-Anglian Novels and the Changing Tradition: A study of the novels of Mulk Raj Anand, Kamala Markandaya, R. K. Narayan & Raja Rao, 1930-64. Mysore. Rao & Raghavan.

Rao, G. Subba. 1954. Indian Words in English: A study in Indo-British cultural and linguistic relaitons. London. Oxford University Press.

Rau, M. C. 1974. The Press. New Delhi.

Report of the English Review Committee. 1965. New Delhi.

Report of the Official Language Commission. 1956. New Delhi. (1957).

Richter, Julius. 1908. A History of Missions in India, trans. by S. N. Moore. New York & Chicago.

Saha, Subhas C. 1971. Modern Indo-Anglian love poetry. Calcutta. Writer's Workshop.

Shah, A. B. ed. 1968. The Great Debate: Language Controversy and Higher Education. Bombay. Asia Publishing House.

Shahane, Vasant Anant. 1972. Khushwant Singh. New York. Twayne Publishers, Inc.

Sharp, H. 1920. Selections from Educational Records Part 1: 1781-1839. Calcutta.

Sherring, Matthew A. 1884. The history of Protestant missions in India from their commencement in 1706 to 1871. London.

Singh, Bhupal. 1934. A survey of Anglo-Indian fiction. London.

Sinha, Krishna Nandan. 1972. Mulk Raj Anand. New York. Twayne Publishers, Inc.

Spencer, Dorothy M. 1960. Indian Fiction in English: An Annotated Bibliography. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Spencer, J. 1966. The Anglo-Indians and their speech: A socio-linguistic essay. Lingua 16: 57-70. Amsterdam.

Sundaram, P. S. 1973. R. K. Narayan. New Delhi. Arnold-Heinemann India.

Vermeer, Hans J. 1969. Das Indo-Englische. Situation und Linguistische Bedeutung (Mit Bibiiographie). Heidelberg. Julius Groos Verlag.

Wadia, A. R. 1954. The Future of English in India. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

Weinreich, U. 1966. Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. The Hague. Mouton.

Williams, Haydn Moore. 1973. Studies in Modern Indian Fiction in English. Calcutta. Writer's Workshop.

Wilson, H. H. 1885. A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms and of Useful Words Occuring in Official Documents Relating to the Administration of the Government of British India. London.

_____. 1940. A Glossary of Judicial and Revenue Terms of British India. Calcutta.

Yule, N. and Burnell, A. C. 1903. Hobson-Jobson: A glossary of colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of kindred terms, etymological, historical, geographical and discursive. J. Murry. London.